

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Thus, the rejection as it applied to claim 2 is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,245,990; hereinafter "Watanabe"). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 1, Watanabe does not disclose that the number of operations that the subsidiary teaching device is allowed to conduct is less than the number of

operations that the primary teaching device is allowed to conduct, and the robot control unit includes a storage device for storing restrict information indicating valid and invalid operations of the subsidiary teaching device. The Office Action states that element 4 being considered restricted vis-à-vis the teaching pendant. However, there is no disclosure in Watanabe that the number of the operations that the element 4 is allowed to conduct is less than the number of the operations that the element 6 is allowed to conduct. Also, Watanabe does not disclose “a storage device for storing restrict information indicating valid and invalid operations of the subsidiary teaching device” recited in the amended claim 1 for the following reason: In Watanabe, an operator checks the operation command, and presses a cancel key if it is incorrect, or presses a check key if it is correct (see Watanabe; column 9, lines 18-30). That is, the operations whether to execute the program are decided (restricted) by the operator. Further, the robot status data in Watanabe merely indicates the current status data of the robot (see Watanabe; column 4, lines 50-67). Accordingly, Watanabe does not teach or suggest “a storage device for storing restrict information indicating valid and invalid operations of the subsidiary teaching device.” Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Watanabe. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In addition, regarding claim 2, Watanabe does not disclose that the operations that the subsidiary teaching device is allowed to conduct are determined by validating the operations that

the subsidiary teaching device is allowed to conduct and invalidating the operations that the subsidiary teaching device is not allowed to conduct in the primary teaching device.

Also, regarding claim 3, Watanabe does not disclose that the operations that the operations that the subsidiary teaching device is allowed to conduct are classified into a plurality of user levels by the primary teaching device, and the subsidiary teaching device includes a user level judging function for judging the user level of the operation. The Office Action states that the user/operator initiates the command in element 4. However, the fact that the user/operator initiates the command does not mean that the operations are classified into a plurality of user levels based on the allowability of the operations. Watanabe is silent about such a classification of the operations into a plurality of user levels based on the allowability of the operations. Also, the Office Action states that the robot control unit disclosed in Watanabe is considered as the user level judging function of claim 3. However, there is no disclosure in Watanabe that the robot control unit judges the user level of the operation.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/534,669
Amdt. Dated: November 7, 2008
Reply to Office action of August 19, 2008

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38149.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 7, 2008